DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 143 SP 014 838

AUTHOR	Krueger, Christine
TITLE	Growth, Rewards, Collaboration in the TEC State.
INSTITUTION	Florida Univ., Gainesville.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jul 79
CONTRACT	G007700121
NOTE	60p.; For related document, see ED 166 148
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College School Cooperation; Decision Making; *Inservice Teacher Education; Motivation; Reinforcement; Resource Centers; *Rewards; *Skill Development; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Role; Teaching Methods; *Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS	Florida

ABSTRACT

This document represents a continuation of efforts partially reported in UNIVERSITIES AND TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS IN FLORIDA. The present (1979) report presupposes the reader's familiarity with the contents of that previous document, and attempts to add to the picture of universities and TEC's by updating developments through the 1978-79 service year. Special attention is paid to issues relating to funding and on rewards to faculty for TEC activities. The increased teacher role in the TEC decision-making process, and the results of that increase are also discussed. Data for this report were gathered from TEC and university staff meetings, from interviews of individuals variously involved with TEC throughout the state of Florida, and from questionnaires completed by 17 TEC directors and 64 college of education faculty members during April 1979. (Author/LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177143

Growth, Rewards, Collaboration in the TEC State

Christine Krueger
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida
July 1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SP 014 958

The material reported herein was prepared pursuant to U.S.O.E. Contract No. G007700121 University of Florida/ Alachua County Schools Teacher Corps Project. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent U.S. Office of Education position or policy.

Acknowledgements

This report was made possible through funds from the University of Florida/Alachua County Schools Teacher Corps Project and the interest of project directors and staff in documenting the development of teacher education centers in Florida.

Since this document is part of efforts continued over the past two years, I would like to acknowledge the cooperation of the many individuals throughout Florida who provided me with information, insights, and personal time during that period. They are all in some way part of the development of teacher education centers and are both proud of accomplishments and committed to making further improvements. It is my hope that in some small way they will find this report useful.

I would also like to thank Roberta Hughey, Suzanne Kinzer, and William Drummond for their interest and assistance in my efforts. Special thanks are due to Ann Garwood for her work in the reproduction and dissemination of research materials and of this report.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.	ii
List of Tables.	iv
Introduction.	1
Continued Growth of Teacher Education Centers	3
Changes in University TEC Organization and Faculty Roles. . .	11
The University TEC Reward System.	17
Joint Funding/Collaboration	21
Participation in TEC Policy Making.	31
Appendix AI	39
Appendix AII.	40

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Types and Adequacy of Rewards for TEC Activity By Institution.	41
2.	Types of Rewards Received and Respondents' Perceptions of Adequacy or Inadequacy.	42
3a.	Respondents With TEC Workloads Up to 200 Hours By Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards and Types of Rewards	43
3b.	Respondents With TEC Workloads More Than 200 Hours By Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards and Types of Rewards	44
4.	Respondents By Size of TEC Workload and Number of Rewards Received.	45
5.	Respondents By Size of TEC Workload and Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards.	45
6.	Average Number of Rewards Received Per Respondent By Size of TEC Workload and Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards	45
7.	Ratio of Direct to Indirect Rewards Received for TEC Activity By Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards.	45
8.	Ratio of Direct to Indirect Rewards By Number of Rewards Received and Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards.	46
9.	Ratio of Direct to Indirect Rewards Received for TEC Activity By Size of TEC Workload and Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards.	46
10.	TEC Activity Represented By Respondents	46
11.	Comparison of Average TEC Workload By Respondents Perception of Rewards As Adequate or Inadequate.	47

Table

Page

12. Respondents By Predominant Rewards and Future TEC Participation. 47

13. Respondents By Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards and Future TEC Participation. 47

14. Respondents By Size of Workload and Future TEC Participation. 48

15. Questionnaire Item: In 1979-81 what kind of funding mechanisms for TEC do you think would be most satisfactory?. 48

16. Questionnaire item to COE faculty: Would you prefer that TEC monies no longer be allocated through the SUS? 48

17. Respondents By Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards and Opinion As To Whether TEC Monies Should Continue To Be Allocated Through the SUS. 49

18. Questionnaire Item: If in 1979-81 resources for TEC are no longer allocated through the State University System, how would your TEC probably be affected?. 50

19. Questionnaire Item: If in 1979-81 resources for TEC activity are no longer allocated through the State University System, i.e., instead all monies for TEC would be located in the school districts and TEC's would purchase individual faculty services privately, how would your participation and your college's participation in TEC probably be affected? 51

Introduction

Since this document represents a continuation of efforts partially reported in Universities and Teacher Education Centers in Florida,[1] it presupposes the reader's familiarity with the contents of that document--the growth of TEC's and university participation in inservice education, the development of university TEC organization and perceived effects on inservice education, on the colleges of education and on COE faculty.

The present report attempts to add to the picture of universities and TEC's by updating developments through the 1978-79 service year, especially on issues related to funding and rewards to faculty for TEC activities, two areas which last year's research identified as most problematic for TEC's. Events which occurred during 1978-79 also encouraged attention to the matter of TEC policy making.

Data for this report were recorded at meetings of TEC directors and university representatives, in interviews with individuals variously involved in TEC development throughout the state, and from questionnaires completed by 17 TEC directors and 64 college of education faculty members in April, 1979.

[1]University of Florida/Alachua County Schools Teacher Corps Project. Gainesville, Florida, December, 1978.

Continued Growth of Teacher Education Centers

After four years of continued growth and policy experimentation, the 1978-79 TEC service year was one of relative stability. In most cases, school districts and universities had evolved effective procedures for arranging services. The adoption of a programmatic basis for handling university TEC resources encouraged early program definition and avoided problems encountered in previous years over the use of funds. Serious shortcomings in the institutionalization of TEC activity still needed attention, but firm and familiar working relationships between colleges and school districts had for the most part been established.

Two events, however, raised questions about future university TEC relationships. First, the drastic increase and changed composition of the TEC client population brought about by the establishment of several new centers since June 1978, may yet produce a restructuring of prevailing university-school district relationships. Second, Governor Graham's recommendation to place all TEC monies in the school districts, though eventually rejected by the legislature, nevertheless augered the possibility of overturning the university TEC role.

Changes in TEC Clientele

With the approach of the July 1, 1979 deadline for the implementation of TEC's in all the school districts in the state,

the number of centers rose from 25 a year ago to 42 as of June. Accordingly, the number of instructional personnel to be served increased from approximately 29,350 to 80,200. With these increases, the population to be served has also taken on new characteristics. The primarily small, rural school districts typical of previous TEC membership have been joined by larger, urban counterparts which represent the majority of the state's teachers and are comparatively more politicized.

Even without the addition of new centers the demand for SUS services to TEC's is expected to increase for the coming year. TEC directors from 14 centers more than a year old at the time of the survey indicated that

(1) Resources available through the State University System had allowed nine centers to carry out virtually all the services planned for the year; five centers indicated that activities had been somewhat restricted.

(2) Six of the centers project that their 1979-80 requests for SUS services will remain at the 1978-79 level; seven anticipate an increase from 10 to 25 percent and one center estimates a 75 percent increase.

Discussions during the 1978-79 meetings of TEC directors and university representatives provided a glimpse of the divisions likely to operate among school districts if SUS resources for TEC are not increased in keeping with the growth in clientele. Directors of older centers, faced with the prospect of having less resources flow in their direction, pointed out that their resources should not be

cut back in order to accommodate incoming school districts. They said that programs which had been carefully built during the early TEC years should not be jeopardized on behalf of school districts which had delayed formation of a center and which were often able to tap greater amounts of local inservice education resources. Older (more rural, less well-endowed) centers also feared that university faculty would be more inclined to respond to requests from newer (more urban and better endowed) centers perceiving them as more interesting and more conveniently located. For their part newer centers claimed that older ones had received a "windfall" of free services from the universities and should not insist on maintaining their advantage.

In 1978-79, older centers represented a greater number of school districts and held the majority of votes within the informal statewide TEC directors and university representatives group. Newer centers represented larger client populations and were seen as powerful in external matters calling for legislative action. The practice of the group has been to strive for consensus in policy matters in order to reflect a solid position to legislators and state administrators. This may be more difficult given the group's change from a relatively homogeneous to a more heterogeneous composition. But that difficulty is more likely to depend on the overall amount of university resources made available to TEC's than on the makeup of the centers themselves. The need for more resources prompted both old and new centers to lobby the legislature to increase funding and to retain the joint funding procedures which place TEC

resources partially within the SUS. Both measures were envisioned as strategies which would preclude the need for centers to compete with each other.

However, competition was reflected in another of the group's decisions. The majority of the directors (from older centers) voted to support a formula for the allocation of university TEC resources with four criteria: a base sum per school district; the number of full-time equivalent personnel to be served by a center, the travel time required between a given center and collaborating universities, and a center's level of past TEC performance. The past performance criterion was intended to guarantee preference for older centers with established TEC programs. Directors of newer centers dissented because this criterion would permanently curb resources for their centers.

University Resources: Some Future Scenarios

The issues of university TEC resources and a larger TEC population suggested various scenarios for future TEC development:

(1) University TEC resources remain at or near current levels in spite of increased demands with a variety of possible consequences:

(a) creation of "seller's" market where university faculty set their own standards for responding to TEC services requests and/or develop their own inservice education components and make them available for TEC's who want them;

(b) increased TEC purchase of services from community colleges, private and out-of-state universities;

(c) greater emphasis on teacher-to-teacher inservice education.

(2) A greater proportion of existing college of education resources are earmarked for TEC forcing colleges to cut back preservice and graduate teacher education programs.

(The legislative intent as indicated in the 1976 and 1977 Appropriations Acts seemed to be that the equivalent of up to 742 FTE students could be used throughout the SUS for TEC service implying a ceiling on college resources and a proportional distribution of those resources between TEC and other programs. In February 1979 university representatives gained the support of TEC directors for the position that other college resources should not be affected by an increase of resources for TEC.)

(3) University TEC monies are increased without affecting other ongoing college of education programs but without the flexibility to expand the number of faculty. In this scenario increased use is made of adjunct personnel to provide TEC services or to assume the regular duties of TEC faculty. At the same time the proportion of TEC services provided on an overload basis grows sharply with the tendency being to perpetuate "one-shot" inservice programs and to limit long-term programs to those that can be done on an inload basis.

(The overload/one-shot, inload/long-term pattern began to develop more strongly during 1978-79. The emphasis, however, was to strive for long-term programs.)

(4) Non-credit (TEC) activities are recognized as a basis for generating resources for colleges of education so that long-term college-school district programs are built to respond to system needs without favoring of slighting any districts.

(Governor Graham has already indicated that future funding for the SUS will be based on program rather than productivity formulas. Legislative staff interviewed reported that work to determine the bases for program-based funding was beginning.)

A fifth scenario involves changes which go beyond the issue of university TEC resources: the restructuring of colleges of education along the lines of professional schools. The models most frequently cited are medical and agricultural models. (Besides lending encouragement to the development of TEC and other programs geared to public needs, this arrangement would have the additional advantage of freeing the administration and reward of TEC activities from limitations presently encountered from the larger university system.)

Along with changes which stem from the amount of university TEC resources and the conditions attached to their use, a larger TEC population can also be expected to affect relationships between TEC directors and university representatives. Presently directors and representatives hold regular statewide meetings to strengthen collaboration. Changes might occur along the lines of

(a) The replacement of state group meetings by regional gatherings, with the former held annually or biennally.

(Such a change would respond primarily to the increase in the number of centers and the addition of representatives from community colleges and private colleges-universities, making frequent statewide meetings impractical and even inefficient.)

(b) A decreasing need for the TEC directors/university representatives group, reflecting a decreasing reliance on university contributions to school district inservice programs.

(c) The establishment of centralized office for TEC within the DOE which would take over the functions of the directors-representatives group.

Teacher Involvement

Another issue which began to surface in 1978-79 with the formation of TEC's in the "big" counties and which might develop more fully during 1979-81 is that of teacher participation in center decision making. The 1973 legislation speaks of three partners in TEC's -- school districts, universities, and the teaching profession--and establishes that classroom teachers hold the majority in center advisory councils. In most school districts (and according to provisions of the 1973 act), teacher members of advisory councils have been appointed by local school boards rather than selected through the organizations of the teaching profession. During 1978-79, the organized teaching profession at both state and local levels

complained about the lack of teacher participation in the development of proposals for new centers and in the selection of new advisory councils. They also objected when the DOE/SCTEC removed the local teacher organization president's signature from center proposals. As teacher organizations step up efforts to strengthen the role of teachers in TEC decision making, they will provide still another source of influence to change the present TEC picture which has focused largely on university-school district collaboration.

Whatever the outcomes, the 1979-81 biennium promises to be a testing period for the university-school district relationships established over the last five years. With this in mind, DOE personnel interviewed anticipated the need for intensive meetings at the outset of the biennium to provide new centers with training in the collaborative skills required for TEC operation, as well as to give all center personnel and university representatives the opportunity to build viable working relationships for another phase of TEC development.

Changes in University TEC Organization and Faculty Roles

Apart from the effects of programmatic funding, few changes were noted in university TEC organization during 1978-79. There were changes in the deanship at three SUS colleges of education and the feeling was that support for TEC at that level was stronger in most colleges. Community colleges and private universities also played a larger, though comparatively small role in the delivery of TEC services.

Most colleges also reported that the TEC consultant role had become more stable. Compared with previous years, consultants were more often involved in providing long-term services and in general TEC planning. In some universities this pattern was accompanied by the tendency for longer-term services to be provided on an inload basis and for short-term services to be covered through overload arrangements. While these institutions tended to use overload or dual compensation more frequently than in the previous year, others moved almost completely to an inload basis for TEC service.

During 1977-78 the University of South Florida was unique in initiating the formation of a regional coordinating council composed of faculty representatives and TEC directors from districts served by USF. Though that council did not function in 1978-79, other universities considered the formation of similar councils. For its part, USF, the institution which has made most elaborate use of

faculty liaisons to collaborating school districts, anticipated adding yet another role to its TEC organization. Faculty members were to be trained using the Florida Linkage System (FLS) model to act as "linkers" with specific schools for the purpose of strengthening communication and building more effective relationships and programs. A full-day session was also held with USF department chairpersons to review TEC commitments and use of faculty for TEC. During 1978-79 each of USF's 14 departments provided 10 percent of the institutions 14,000 hour TEC load. Current plans are to begin internal staff development for TEC work and to encourage faculty to see TEC's as places for research.

In inter-university collaboration, university TEC representatives met only once in 1978-79 as opposed to twice in the previous year, though representatives suggested a second meeting might be held before finalizing agreements for the coming service period. While university representatives did not want to interfere in the TEC's ability to request services where they chose, it was felt that planning might be facilitated by joint consideration of requests and resources.

In the April meeting of TEC directors and university representatives, Dr. P. C. Wu of the University of West Florida was elected as chairperson for the coming year, a position which had been previously held only by TEC directors.

Programmatic Funding

Finding adequate procedures for allocating university TEC monies has been a major concern of the Board of Regents, Department of

Education, colleges of education and TEC's since SUS allocations began in 1974. Each year funding procedures have changed, contributing to insecurity and instability in the university TEC system and erecting major obstacles to its institutionalization. In 1978-79 procedures called for establishing a central fund in the Department of Education and dispersing it to the various universities through the Board of Regents after specific service agreements had been developed between colleges of education and TEC's. Releasing funds programmatically and from a central source succeeded on two counts. First, service programs were defined more fully at an earlier time enabling colleges to make faculty load assignments more realistically and with less improvisation. Secondly, funds intended for TEC activities were more efficiently used for those purposes. Friction with some academic vice presidents over the use of TEC monies seemed to be eliminated and most colleges reported improved arrangements for internal administration of TEC funds. The success of the programmatic funding procedure was reflected in the recommendation made by the TEC directors and university representatives group to continue it during the next funding period.

A separate issue related to the use of the university TEC allocation arose from TEC directors' complaints that university formulas for translating service hours into costs reduced the amount of services which TEC's might receive from universities based on the dollar amount allocated. Directors reasoned that the university charge of $27 per hour, including hours spent in travel and planning, typically brought a day of

onsite service to a cost more than double the consultant rate of $150 per day plus travel expenses.

In a questionnaire item, directors were asked to estimate differences in cost for a day of TEC service when (a) purchased directly by the centers and (b) charged by the universities according to formulas which included travel and planning as well as onsite time. Only seven directors responded to the question. One indicated no difference in cost; one indicated that consulting fees were slightly higher than university charges; five estimated that university charges exceeded consulting fees by 50 to 250 percent. Such inflated costs have prompted some directors to favor district control over all TEC monies. However, when actually faced with an opportunity to vote on the issue directors opted to maintain the flow of monies through the university system rather than risk the loss of formal collaboration with universities. Moreover, in another questionnaire item directors were about equally divided over whether full control of TEC monies would enable them to purchase SUS services more economically than under present university charges (see Table 18).

The university rationale behind charges for TEC services (i.e., the inclusion of travel and planning time at the same rate as onsite time) emerged within the principle that those services should be performed as part of the regular faculty workload. As such, compensation should match basic faculty salary and cover the real number of hours required to provide a specific service. (Appendix A, I and II cite official calculations used to arrive

at the $27 per hour rate and the kinds of activities which it should cover.) This logic was also consistent with both the legislative mandate that colleges of education should shift their resources to include an emphasis on inservice education and with the practice of equating the TEC dollar figure with the number of faculty positions made available for TEC work. In short, the issue of just costs to the school districts is the other side of the coin of just rewards to university faculty. A question not yet addressed is whether services performed on an overload basis should be remunerated on the same principles as services performed on an inload basis.

The University TEC Reward System

TEC directors and college of education faculty polled a year ago cited the lack of adequate rewards to university faculty for TEC work as the most serious shortcoming of the TEC system. Faculty respondents said that TEC activity was less rewarded than research, teaching, and governance--activities on which faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure are traditionally based. They also indicated that the problem was more acute at the level of the larger university system than within the colleges of education themselves.

In an attempt to get a more concrete sense of the rewards for TEC activity, college of education faculty this year were asked to specify which of nine kinds of rewards they received. They were also asked to make a general indication of whether these rewards taken as a whole were adequate or inadequate. About half the respondents (30) said that rewards were adequate; 32 said they were inadequate. Table 1 shows the kinds of rewards received and the overall adequacy of rewards by university. The number of cases per institution is small and provides data that should be regarded as suggestive rather than conclusive.

What the data do suggest is that both the content and the perceived adequacy of rewards vary from institution to institution. The four institutions with better than average ratings for adequacy (USF, UCF, UF, UWF) show different patterns. USF relies on a system which combines reduced instructional load with basic salary and/or

overload payment. UCF emphasizes the same rewards but with relative priority on overload payment (or dual compensation). The UF system uses basic salary payment and expense transfers to complement reduced instructional loads. UWF puts most emphasis on expense transfers and, unlike the other institutions, makes relatively little use of reduced workload, overload payment, or basic salary support.

Data for all institutions were further examined to determine the perceived adequacy of certain rewards or combinations of rewards and how this perception related to other variables such as the size and nature of the TEC workload and the intention to increase or decrease future TEC activity. (Tables 2 through 14). The results may be summarized as follows:

(1) "Expense transfers" is the only single reward category which shows a strong relationship to "adequacy" (Table 2).

(2) The number of rewards tends to increase along with the size of the TEC workload (as measured in total number of hours), but the adequacy of rewards does not improve (Tables 3a, 3b, 4, 5, 6).

(3) Adequate rewards at both low and high workload levels were those which balanced "direct" (expense transfers, basic salary, overload payment, fourth quarter employment) and "indirect" compensations (personal satisfaction, reduced workload, credit toward promotion/tenure or salary increase) (Tables 3a, 3b, 7, 8, 9).

(4) While the number of rewards increases with TEC workload, direct rewards decrease in proportion to indirect rewards,

especially in cases where rewards are judged inadequate (Table 9).

(5) When workloads are compared, those judging TEC rewards adequate spent an average of 34 hours less in TEC work during the 1978-79 service year than those judging them inadequate (Table 11).

(6) Those who perceived rewards as adequate spent an average of 19 hours less onsite, 23 hours less in travel, 7 hours less in planning and 15 hours more in "other" TEC activities than those who perceived rewards as inadequate (Table 11).

(7) Both groups spent almost the same percent of their total TEC load in onsite and planning activities. Those with inadequate rewards spend relatively more time in travel and less in "other" TEC activities. For those with inadequate rewards, travel time was 60% of onsite time, while it was only 45% of onsite time for the group with adequate rewards (Table 11).

Analysis of rewards received by those who judge them as adequate indicates that adequate rewards tend to exist where

(1) a sufficient number of direct rewards are received

(2) rewards match individual workload

(3) travel time does not become excessive in relation to onsite time or overall workload.

The data may also be read to suggest that a viable reward system for faculty in TEC activity need not necessarily rest on promotion and tenure (issues which require confrontation with the larger

university system), but may also be established through greater use of such things as expense transfers, overload payment, and basic salary support (which may be controlled by the colleges themselves).

An attempt was made to test this hypothesis with data at hand by comparing the predominance of direct and indirect rewards with individual faculty projections to increase or decrease future TEC activity. It was expected that those who received more direct rewards would be more inclined to project an increase. Table 12, however, shows that the data did not support the hypothesis. However, the hypothesis rests on the assumption that individual faculty are free to determine their own level of TEC involvement and tailor it to the adequacy of rewards received. This may not be the case. Furthermore, projection of increased activity may relate more directly to the increase in TEC's and clients to be served in the coming year than to individual satisfaction with rewards for TEC activity. Table 13 suggests that future participation is at best weakly related to adequacy or inadequacy of rewards.

Joint Funding/Collaboration

Governor Graham's budget recommendation to place TEC monies entirely within the school districts was a dominant concern for TEC parties throughout the state. Specifically, adoption of the recommendation would have removed more than 1.3 million dollars from the university system budget, leaving universities with no resources set aside for the formal support of TEC activities. Interpreters of the recommendation in the state department of administration said it was based on the principle that monies should be placed as closely as possible to the client base. An excerpt from the budget document stated:

> To decentralize education decision making and return appropriate responsibility and capability for local control to persons directly affected by the decisions, state funds for student textbooks, health education, school lunch programs, environmental education, law education, teacher education centers, and student development services are included in the Florida Education Finance Program.

In a note on the matter, the budget document indicated that "It is intended that these [TEC] services continue to be a collaborative effort between the public school system and institutions of higher education." However, as most TEC sources saw it, collaboration was indeed at stake and the governor's plan would have radically altered the Florida TEC model which, based on the 1973 Teacher Education Center Act, called for institutional collaboration with funds flowing

through both the school districts and the universities. For some, the elimination of joint funding/collaboration would have been a step backwards, returning inservice education arrangements to a pre-TEC state. Others maintained that for various reasons (most beyond the control of TEC parties), the collaboration intended by the model had not been realized.

Theoretically, the change away from the joint funding characteristic of Florida's TEC's, might have provided them greater flexibility and economy in purchasing services. Likewise, it might have helped improve rewards received by university TEC faculty whose services would have been individually negotiated and directly remunerated through consultant fees proscribed under the joint system.

While the governor's recommendation was opposed by the majority of TEC parties and finally rejected by the legislature, it raised questions about both TEC collaboration and policy making. The following pages report (1) the preferences of those concerned with TEC's regarding the flow of monies through the SUS and (2) some perceptions of the processes accompanying TEC legislation.

Preferences Regarding Joint Funding

Opinions regarding the continuation of joint funding and the consequences anticipated were it eliminated, were gathered from TEC directors and university representatives, teacher organization representatives, legislators, and legislative and DOE staffs.

It was reported above that TEC directors and university representatives in their regular meetings opted to support the

continuation of joint funding. It was also suggested that their decision was related to a cost-benefit analysis which favored maintaining school district-university collaboration as a means of offsetting scarce resources.

The decision to support the flow of TEC monies through the SUS was reflected in questionnaire responses as well. Sixteen of the directors polled responded to an item which asked what kind of funding they felt would be most satisfactory for 1979-81. Thirteen indicated that monies should continue to be allocated through the universities and be handled programmatically as in 1978-79. Eight of these, felt that procedures followed in 1978-79 were entirely appropriate. The other five directors said that university charges for travel and/or planning time should be reduced. Another three respondents wanted all TEC monies to go directly to the school districts (Table 15). In relative figures, continued joint funding was favored by a greater proportion of TEC directors (81%) than of university TEC faculty (52%). Only 10 faculty (15%), however, actually favored no longer allocating monies through the SUS; most were undecided (Table 16).

Both groups were also asked to anticipate some of the consequences of eliminating joint funding. Tables 18 and 19 report these results in detail. Consequences expected by the majority of TEC directors and/or TEC faculty include:

(1) Difficulty in contracting the university faculty for long-term services. The majority of faculty respondents said that <u>maybe</u> TEC's would negotiate through contracts and

grants offices so that faculty services could be obtained on a long-term basis. TEC directors, however, were somewhat less inclined to agree and suggested that TEC's would look instead to other sources to develop their inservice efforts.

Item: In data compiled last year, directors indicated that long-term services were more effective and COE faculty said that they were more rewarding as well. During 1978-79 efforts were made on both sides to increase the proportion of long-term services.

(2) Institutional collaboration between school districts and universities would be greatly diminished. Simultaneously, faculty respondents said that the overall contribution of their colleges to inservice education would be diminished, though they felt that the quality of services provided to TEC's would stay the same.

Item: Presumably university TEC organization and its coordinating functions would no longer be maintained (though directors were less inclined to identify this as an anticipated consequence according to Table 18, #3) nor would the legislative mandate that colleges of education shift their resources to include an emphasis on inservice education (1976 and 1977 Appropriation Acts) remain tenable.

(3) TEC's would become more competitive with each other to obtain SUS services.

Item: At least half the TEC services provided through

the SUS are drawn from the assigned faculty workload. Presumably these would no longer be available except at special cost to the TEC's and some of these services would disappear altogether just as the number of clients to be served through TEC's is increasing.

(4) TEC efforts to influence preservice teacher education programs would be hindered.

Item: Lack of progress toward this TEC goal is a major dissatisfaction among TEC directors and advisory council members as well as college of education faculty.

Opinions about the desirability and consequences of doing away with joint funding were also sought from other sources. In an interview, the TEC liaison for FTP-NEA said the teachers' organization was less concerned about the elimination of joint funding per se, than that TEC monies be earmarked and that a stipulated portion be spent in the SUS in order to assure a resource base for continued collaboration. If funds were not earmarked, FTP feared they would be controlled by school district superintendents rather than teachers.

The AFT delegate assembly, according to the representative interviewed, had agreed to lobby for an increase in overall funding for TEC's but had no official position with respect to joint funding. The position of the lobbyist was that concentration of TEC monies in the school districts would undermine collaboration which rests on each party having resources with which to negotiate. He feared that this principle had already been eroded by the introduction of

programmatic funding which tended to bureaucratize TEC decision making.

Both teachers' organizations, according to the representatives interviewed, felt that local decision making about inservice education was controlled more by school boards and superintendents than by teachers. They shared the opinion that placing TEC monies in the school districts, especially if not earmarked, did not mean placing them in the hands of the clients (i.e., teachers) but in those of superintendents. In the words of the AFT representative, "Power is increasingly being siphoned away from teachers and universities in the name of giving it back to the school boards, but the school boards are dominated by the superintendents."

An assessment to which both representatives seemed to subscribe might be phrased as follows: In TEC development until now, universities and school districts have made progress in building collaborative relationships, though there remains much to be done. However, there are really three TEC partners -- school districts, universities, and the teaching profession. Only now (with the entry into TEC's of counties where teacher power is more highly developed) is the TEC movement ready for the process of working out full-scale, three-way collaboration. Putting all resources in the hands of superintendents at this point would be tantamount not only to halting a process, but reversing the principle of collaboration at its most critical stage.

House Education Committee staff members interviewed held the opinion that district-university collaboration in TEC had improved greatly in the 1978-79 service period. Their barometer? Legislators

were no longer receiving complaints and school districts had indicated they favored retaining joint funding according to the 1978-79 procedures.

In contrast, the head of the Senate Education Committee observed during a March interview that "collaboration hasn't worked." He felt that neither the universities nor the school districts had been entirely faithful in their use of monies legislated for inservice education. With respect to the universities, he said that the same problems recurred year after year: individual professors were willing TEC participants, but tended to be "punished professionally" because TEC work was not rewarded within the university system; funds intended for TEC faculty support were lost in the labyrinths of university administration. He favored removing monies from the SUS on the principle that "producers should not control decisions." On the school district side, he had some misgivings about use of inservice monies as well. Though he advocated placing monies entirely in the school districts so that decisions about inservice education could be made locally, he was reluctant that they be made by superintendents. He emphasized that professions knew their own inservice needs best and felt that earmarking inservice funds would ensure their use for inservice ends as determined by teachers themselves.

In April the Senate Education Committee and Appropriations Subcommittee invited representatives from school districts and universities to attend a joint hearing, at which one of the agenda items was TEC funding. "We got you all together to straighten this out once and for all," remarked the Education Committee chairman.

University representatives assured senators that problems regarding TEC monies had been resolved. Senators were told that over the years funding for colleges of education had been reduced to the point that meeting TEC commitments required manipulation of resources, but that commitments had indeed been met. A representative from the TEC directors noted that tight SUS funding and annual changes in TEC funding procedures had "wreaked havoc" with program building. He encouraged legislators to leave the joint funding system in place, noting that resources allocated through universities both assured their collaboration and served as a basis for accountability. He further urged an increase in university funding for TEC so that universities would have the means to broaden their TEC involvement to include research and scholarly work in the TEC field. The consensus of those who testified on behalf of TEC's seemed to be that valuable collaborative efforts had been possible through the joint funding system. They agreed that further improvements were necessary, but felt that continuation of joint funding was currently the best foundation for their accomplishment.

In a letter to a local representative, the dean of University of South Florida's college of education noted another concern related to the proposed elimination of joint funding. Since the monies which the governor proposed be placed in the school districts were the equivalent of 59 university faculty positions, those positions would no longer be maintained. The USF dean stated that this would leave colleges of education "without the resources needed to respond to the inservice training needs of the local school districts. Many

collaborative programs that we have developed with school districts would have to be terminated."

Department of Education and other administrative personnel interviewed also felt that following the governor's recommendation would be the "demise" of institutional collaboration in TEC.

The conclusion drawn from the above interviews and questionnaire results is that most parties supported collaboration/joint funding as a TEC foundation, though with a variety of motives and reservations.

Participation in TEC Policy Making

Responses to the governor's funding recommendation and the expression of views regarding joint funding/collaboration provided an opportunity to observe the context of TEC policy making. While the exact processes leading to policy outcomes are largely not observable from the outside, nevertheless parts of the processes can be reconstructed.

A March meeting of university TEC representatives provided an opportunity to observe perceptions regarding their participation in TEC policy making. The representatives agreed that adoption of the recommendation threatened to eliminate their colleges' role in TEC's. While some of them doubted that the recommendation would be adopted, their assessment was that they had no institutional channels through which to attempt to influence that outcome. College of education deans also were discounted as an influence channel with the observation that they have had virtually no role in shaping TEC policy. The group's position was summed up by one speaker who said, "We never have input into decision making; but I agree with [a previous speaker] that there is probably nothing we can do except work with the local TEC's to influence individual legislators."

The internal decision of the combined TEC directors and university representatives group was to support joint funding procedures. But as an unofficial body with no direct policy making role, this group

typically relies on three influences strategies. The first is communication with Department of Education (DOE) and Board of Regents (BOR) representatives who attend the group's regular meetings. While this communication is useful in routine matters, in matters of broad policy it has little effect since some of these representatives are prevented by job regulations from acting as policy advocates. They do, however, transmit group decisions and sentiments to personnel from the offices of the Commissioner of Education who often work closely with legislators in policy development.

Another strategy of the combined TEC directors and university representatives group is to rely on the special efforts of the TEC director located in Tallahassee to convey group decisions to appropriate policy makers in the capital and to keep abreast of policy developments during legislative sessions. The third strategy is for individual directors to indicate their wishes to legislators and other local officials.

Still another body, the State Council for Teacher Education Centers (SCTEC), though officially constituted by law and with powers to "recommend guidelines for expenditure of funds for teacher education centers" according to the TEC Act, has been notably absent from TEC policy making except during the first year of its existence. In 1978, legislators saw the council as superfluous and contemplated disbanding it. DOE officials, however, recommended that it be retained at least through the completion of the proposal review process for the establishment of new TEC's, a task which became virtually the sole function of the council during 1978-79. At the

time of writing there are indications that the SCTEC's role in center evaluation may be strengthened during the coming year. Such a change would probably increase the council's influence in policy making.

The above examples are few, yet point to a common theme: There are no direct, specialized channels through which TEC parties participate in policy making; policy making for TEC resides with the legislators. The TEC case is illustrative of what a UF professor has noted is currently a major trend in the education field: "Decisions are increasingly made by legislators instead of educators." While the job of legislators is certainly to make policy, there are two related concerns which are essential to goal accomplishment: (1) the participation of those affected by decision/policy outcomes; (2) the assumption of ownership by those responsible for program implementation.

Documentation over the past 18 months has been limited to the college of education role in TEC's in the state. Judging from interviews and events which have occurred during that period, colleges have had virtually no direct influence on TEC policy since its beginning. According to the reports of several COE deans, the TEC Act of 1973 came as a surprise. Some of them had discussed TEC notions with legislators, but they were not involved in the design of the Florida TEC model, although that model has been unique in the extent to which COE's have been established as formal collaborators. One legislator noted that "only after the ball was already rolling did the deans come along and ask to participate because they saw that TEC was going to affect their budgets in a major way." The

remark implies that in the legislator's opinion the deans were lagging behind, but it also suggests that their participation had not been sought at the outset.

As in previous years, lack of participation in policy making in 1978 and 1979 left deans and TEC coordinators surrounded by unknowns and waiting until decisions were made "in Tallahassee" before gearing up for the next year's TEC program. In the spring of 1978, COE deans were called to a meeting in Tallahassee where they were informed, through the Board of Regents, of the legislative decision to establish programmatic funding procedures (at the recommendation of a DOE task force which did not specifically consult with colleges of education on the matter) for handling university TEC monies. The deans and coordinators assembled opposed the decision which involved centralizing funds and implied lessening college autonomy in principle if not in fact. In the spring of 1979 the unknowns were more radical than before: perhaps there would be no university TEC monies at all or again, perhaps the sum would be so large that colleges would be inundated with TEC requests to the detriment of other programs or in excess of faculty resources.

Besides limiting ability to plan, lack of participation in policy making has caused double-edged difficulties for COE's in their TEC role: Since policies are not designed with an awareness of COE realities, implementation is made more complex on the one hand and on the other falls short of expectation. The gap between implementation and expectation was reflected in statements by legislators. "Collaboration hasn't worked." "Universities are not

committed to TEC involvement." "College faculty working with TEC's should be out there, like extension agents, deeply and continually involved in the field; but they don't seem to have realized that this is what was needed and wanted."

Such comments made by legislators and aides convey a feeling of impatience and even dismay with the university role in TEC's, an opinion held by some TEC faculty themselves. But in the colloquial phrase of one university TEC coordinator, TEC legislation has put colleges of education between "a rock and a hard place." On the one hand there is a legislative mandate to shift resources toward inservice education through TEC's and the willingness and efforts of many faculty members to do so. On the other hand, there has been a modicum of resources, a continual uncertainty about whether they would be renewed and how they might be used, a highly inadequate reward system, and the increased difficulties of institutional change when conditions promote improvisation instead of firm restructuring.

The impression which comes from listening to legislators and college of education faculty is that lack of participation in TEC policy making actually reflects an adversary relationship between the two parties. Faculty view legislators as insensitive; legislators view faculty as unresponsive, though perhaps it is more accurate to say that legislators view the larger university system as unresponsive.

In practice, TEC collaboration has been construed as belonging to the level of program implementation. That is, legislators have reserved the broad TEC policy making role to themselves while insisting that TEC parties collaborate at the program level. It seems a fair judgement that much of the difficulty surrounding the college of

education role in TEC's could have been and might still be avoided if there were mechanisms for TEC collaboration at the level of policy making. Without participation in policy making by those involved in implementation (not only colleges of education, but directors and advisory councils, and teacher organizations as well), TEC policy making is forced to remain dependent on personalities and contexts rather than on program considerations. A major effect of personality-based policy making from above is that program implementation must often resort to improvisation from below.

The effective and continued realization of TEC goals require that operations pass from a state of improvisation to one of adequate and efficient institutionalization. The following chart summarizes some considerations with regard to the colleges of education/TEC situation. Individual colleges may be closer to the "institutionalization" than to the "improvisation" side of the chart on any particular dimension. While other dimensions might be added to the chart, those included have surfaced in documentation research over the last two years.

During the coming biennium each of the TEC parties -- school districts, colleges of education, and teacher organizations -- will confront the task of finding the best means to bring an expanded, more complex TEC program from a state of improvisation to one of effective, collaboration-based institutionalization. If implementing parties can work out the terms of collaboration among themselves and with TEC policy makers, the 1979-81 period will mark a transition from experimental beginnings (1975-79) to collaboratively designed policies and programs, and shared program ownership.

From Improvisation to Institutionalization: Some Considerations on Various Dimensions of College of Education Teacher Education Center Activity

DIMENSIONS	FROM	TO
Policy making	. from above (legislative, centralized) . personality/context dependent . impression-based evaluation . idealistic; goal-focused . adversary legislator-college of education relationship	. collaborative . regular input from TEC parties, COE deans and TEC coordinators . data-based evaluation according to reference criteria . realistic; focus on institutional and implementation components as well as goals . mutual interest relationship between legislators and colleges of education/mutual accountability
Goals and priorities	. vaguely outlined in legislation at general level . limited to current MIP/school district specifications	. clearly defined at operational level and translated into objectives and strategies in terms of both school district and college of education priorities
Resources (a) monies	. annual . restricted to direct provision with existing COE faculty	. periodic (allows for planning and program development) . extended to R & D activities (including research, evaluation, planning, faculty development) and to be used as needed in supporting adequate TEC faculty without harm to other college of education programs
(b) faculty	. drawn almost entirely from colleges of education	. drawn from all parts of the university as appropriate to program needs (with COE coordination to maintain overall program coherence and linkage for faculty unfamiliar with public schools)

(Continued)

DIMENSIONS	FROM	TO
Programs	. externally generated (colleges respond to school district plans) . limited to inservice teacher education	. colleges participate in program development pooling COE contributions and needs in TEC goal areas along with those of school districts . expanded to improve preservice teacher education and preservice-inservice coordination
Organization	. tenuous and unstable (because of resource and program restrictions); not clearly established and visible alongside other college units; relies largely on improvisation; tends to react to school district requests	. clearly defined TEC unit structures and functions, with mechanisms for interfacing with other college/university units and for both responding and initiating to other TEC parties
TEC Faculty Roles	. fragmented by emphasis on short-term services with little opportunity for planning, evaluation, and other developmental activities . total faculty underutilized . add-on to existing workload . liaison roles only partially developed	. clearly defined and stable with opportunity for range of activities suitable to program requirements . optimum utilization of all faculty . improvement of faculty capabilities through faculty development experiences . development of boundary spanning roles (e.g., liaison, linker, advisory council representative) which improve college-school district communication and collaboration in program development
Rewards	. heavy reliance on "volunteers" and indirect rewards . ambiguity regarding value of TEC activity for promotion and tenure	. adequate recognition of TEC activity (a) toward professional advancement (b) in relation to additional demands

Appendix A
I

Excerpt from "1977-78 Teacher Education Center Fund Plan," Office of the Commissioner of Education, Memorandum dated August 17, 1977.

TEC Service Definitions

An August 23, 1976 memorandum developed out of consultation with Senator Curtis Peterson, from Cecil Golden to Chancellor E.T. York, clarifies what costs are to be included in computing faculty time provided through TEC's by the faculty of the SUS. The interpretation is as follows:

> "That cost which is incurred from the time the faculty member leaves the university campus until he returns, including salary, employee benefits, travel, per diem, and training materials, plus the direct administrative cost to the college of education for administering off-campus teacher education center activities."

In order to have a common definition for districts and universities of teacher education center services, a TEC service hour has been devised as a unit of measure to be used as a common means of calculating the services to be provided. A dollar value per TEC service hour has been determined by dividing the value of the "per day faculty consultant cost" by the hours in a TEC contact day (6). The 6-hour value for the contact day has been derived from the traditional length of time used to define a district inservice module. The dollar value of a TEC service hour will be $27.00 for 1977-78. That value was derived as shown in Figure 2. In addition, a number of on-campus activity hours may be required to provide needed services to the field and should be reflected in the Teacher Education Center Service Agreement and Report, which reflects the agreements between the University and the district.

Appendix A
II

Per Day Faculty Consultant Cost for Teacher Education
Center Participation by University Personnel
1976-77

	Number of Positions	Salary Rate/Amount	Retirement	Social Security	Health Insurance	Total
Salary Costs						
Faculty[a]						
Instructional	1.00	$15,899[b]	$1,431	$671	$121	$18,122
Administrative	.08	1,272	115	54	10	1,451
Total Faculty	1.08	$17,171	$1,546	$725	$131	$19,573
Career Service	.38	2,549	230	149	46	2,974
Total Salaries	1.46	$19,720	$1,776	$874	$177	$22,547
Expenses						$ 1,669[c]
Total Direct Annual Costs						$24,216
Working Days Per Year						164[d]
Total Direct Cost Per Working Day						$147.66

[a] Nine-month Average
[b] Estimated Average for Upper Level Education Faculty Member
[c] Based on $1,545 per Position; Includes cost of travel and per diem
[d] Excludes holidays, annual leave, and sick leave allowance

For 1977-78 the calculation is as follows: $147.66 + 10% (for inflation) = $162.43
$162 ÷ 6 hour/TEC day = $27.00 per TEC Contact Hour

Source: "1977-78 Teacher Education Center Fund Plan," Office of the Commissioner of Education, August, 1977.

Table 1. Types and Adequacy of Rewards for TEC Activity By Institution

Institution/ # Responding	Types of Rewards: Personal Satisfa.	Overload Payment	Reduction Instruct.	Salary TEC	Expense Transfers	Salary Increase	Promotion/ Tenure	Reduction Noninstruc.	4th Qtr. Employment	# Reward Categories Mentioned	Rewards Adequate %
USF 12	12	5	10	6	1	3	0	0	1	7	66.6
UCF 9	6	7	3	4	0	1	1	2	0	7	66.6
UF 9	7	1	5	6	5	2	2	1	0	8	66.6
FIU 9	6	8	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	6	22.2
FSU 6	6	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	16.6
UNF 6	3	4	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	16.6
UWF 8	6	2	1	1	8	1	1	0	0	7	62.5
FAU 4	4	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	50.0
TOTAL 63	50	30	25	22	14	10	7	4	1	9	50.0

Table 2. Types of Rewards Received and Respondents' Perceptions of Adequacy or Inadequacy[1]

Rewards Include	Total	Adequate	Inadequate
Personal Satisfaction	50	23	27
Overload Payment	30	14	16
Reduction Instructional Load	25	11	14
Salary from TEC Monies	22	12	10
Expense Transfers	14	11	3
Salary Increase	10	5	5
Promotion/Tenure	7	4	3
Reduction Noninstructional Load	4	2	2
4th Quarter Employment	1	1	0

[1]Most respondents receive rewards of more than one type simultaneously, e.g. personal satisfaction, overload payment, reduction in instructional load. In this table the adequacy or inadequacy rating refers to the respondent's judgement about all rewards rather than about a single reward. The table combines responses to two questionnaire items:

(a) What compensation have you received for your TEC activity? (Respondents checked rewards received from nine different categories.)

(b) Has this compensation been adequate or inadequate?

Table 3a. Respondents With TEC Workloads Up to 200 Hours By Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards and Types[1] of Rewards

	Adequate (N=17)									Inadequate (N=15)								
	Indirect					Direct				Indirect					Direct			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 - 50 hours	X					X				X			X					
	X								X	X	X	X						X
	X	X							X									
									X									
51 - 100 hours				X						X								
						X												X
	X			X				X		X								X
	X					X			X	X							X	
										X								X
													X					X
										X								X
101 - 200 hours	X			X						X								X
	X					X							X					X
						X				X								X
	X								X								X	
	X								X	X								
	X			X		X				X			X					
	X	X						X	X									
	X					X		X	X									
	X	X	X	X		X		X										

Total X/N

Adequate	Inadequate
Indirect=22/17=1.29	Indirect=17/15=1.13
Direct=20/17=1.18	Direct=11/15= .73
Direct/Indirect= .92	Direct/Indirect= .64

[1]Rewards are coded as follows:

1. Personal satisfaction
2. Credit toward promotion/tenure
3. Credit toward salary increase
4. Reduction in instructional load
5. Reduction in noninstructional load
6. Expense transfers
7. Preference for fourth quarter employment
8. Salary paid at least partially through TEC monies
9. Additional income through overload payment

Table 3b. Respondents With TEC Workloads More Than 200 Hours By Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards and Types[1] of Rewards

	Adequate (N=11)										Inadequate (N=13)								
	Indirect					Direct					Indirect					Direct			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
201 - 300 hours	X	X	X	X		X X		X X			X X X X X			X X X				X	X
301 - 400 hours	X X		X		X			X	X X		X X X X X		X X	X X X X	X			X X X	X X
401 - 500 hours	X X X X X		X X	X X X X		X	X	X X X	X X X		X			X		X			X
501 + hours	X				X				X		X X	X	X			X		X	X
Total X/N	Indirect=21/11=1.91 Direct=16/11=1.45 Direct/Indirect= .76										Indirect=26/13=2.00 Direct=13/13=1.00 Direct/Indirect= .50								

[1]Rewards are coded as follows:

1. Personal satisfaction
2. Credit toward promotion/tenure
3. Credit toward salary increase
4. Reduction in instructional load
5. Reduction in noninstructional load
6. Expense transfers
7. Preference for fourth quarter employment
8. Salary paid at least partially through TEC monies
9. Additional income through overload payment

Table 4. Respondents By Size of TEC Workload and Number of Rewards Received

TEC Workload	Rewards	
	1 or 2	3 or More
Up to 200 hours	26	10
More than 200 hours	8	17

Table 5. Respondents By Size of TEC Workload and Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards

TEC Workload	Rewards	
	Adequate	Inadequate
Up to 200 hours	18	18
More than 200 hours	12	14

Table 6. Average Number of Rewards Received Per Respondent By Size of TEC Workload and Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards

TEC Workload	Rewards	
	Adequate	Inadequate
Up to 200 hours	2.6	1.9
More than 200 hours	3.4	3.0

Table 7. Ratio of Direct to Indirect Rewards Received for TEC Activity By Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards

	Direct/Indirect
Adequate	.84
Inadequate	.56

Table 8. Ratio of Direct to Indirect Rewards By Number of Rewards Received and Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards

TEC Workload	Direct/Indirect Adequate	Inadequate
1 or 2 rewards	1.00	.50
3 or more rewards	.81	.65

Table 9. Ratio of Direct to Indirect Rewards Received for TEC Activity By Size of TEC Workload and Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards

TEC Workload	Direct/Indirect Adequate	Inadequate
Up to 200 hours	.92	.64
More than 200 hours	.76	.50

Table 10. TEC Activity Represented By Respondents (N=62)

		%
Total Hours	12809	100.0
Onsite	5557	43.4
Travel	3051	23.8
Planning	2976	23.2
Other	622	4.9
Unspecified	603	4.7

Table 11. Comparison of Average TEC Workload By Respondents Perception of Rewards As Adequate or Inadequate

	Adequate N=26	%	Inadequate N=31	%
Average total hours	194	100.0	228	100.0
Average hours onsite	87	44.8	106	46.5
Average hours travel	40	20.6	63	27.6
Travel/onsite		(45)		(60)
Average hours planning	48	24.7	55	24.1
Average hours other	19	9.8	4	1.8

Table 12. Respondents By Predominant Rewards and Future TEC Participation

Future TEC Participation	Predominantly Indirect	Predominantly Direct
Increase or stay the same	21	15
Decrease of don't know	6	21

Table 13. Respondents By Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards and Future TEC Participation

Future TEC Participation	Adequate	Inadequate
Increase or stay the same	19	16
Decrease or don't know	12	16

Table 14. Respondents By Size of Workload and Future TEC Participation

Future TEC Participation	TEC Workload	
	Up To 200 Hours	More Than 200 Hours
Increase or stay the same	22	13
Decrease or don't know	16	12

Table 15. Questionnaire Item:

In 1979-81 what kind of funding mechanisms for TEC do you think would be most satisfactory?

As it has been in 1978-79	8
All TEC monies should be allocated to school districts with no strings attached	3
Monies should be allocated to school districts, but some portion should be earmarked for expenditure in universities	0
Monies should be allocated to districts, but some provision should be made to maintain positions for TEC coordination in the colleges of education	0
Monies should be allocated as they have through the SUS, but charges should be reduced for travel and/or planning time	5

Table 16. Questionnaire item to COE faculty: Would you prefer that TEC monies no longer be allocated through the SUS?

Yes	10
No	33
Indifferent	4
Don't know	17

Table 17. Respondents By Perceived Adequacy or Inadequacy of Rewards and Opinion As To Whether TEC Monies Should Continue To Be Allocated Through the SUS

	Adequate	Inadequate
Continue	16	16
Do not continue*	2	8
Indifferent or don't know	13	8

*Of ten respondents, five were from a single institution, FSU. The total number of respondents from FSU was six.

Table 18. Questionnaire Item: If in 1979-81 resources for TEC are no longer allocated through the State University System, how would your TEC probably be affected?

EFFECT	YES	NO	MAYBE	DON'T KNOW
1. Presumably more money would be added to the $5/FTE inservice budget	8	3	4	2
2. More SUS services could be purchased for the same or even smaller amounts of money	5	6	2	4
3. SUS services would be more difficult to obtain because channels for coordination with the universities would probably deteriorate	8	2	4	3
4. SUS services would be more easily obtained because it is simpler to work with individual faculty	4	6	3	3
5. Institutional collaboration with universities would be greatly diminished	11	2	2	2
6. Relationships between universities and school districts would be essentially like they were before the establishment of TEC	8	6	1	2
7. The overall quality of services obtained from SUS sources would be improved	1	8	1	7
8. It would be more difficult to contract with university faculty for long-term services	12	3	0	2
9. In general, TEC's more distant from universities would have greater difficulty in obtaining SUS services than they do at present	8	3	1	5
10. TEC's would become more competitive with each other about obtaining SUS services	11	1	4	1
11. TEC's would have greater control over the amount and quality of services obtained from the universities	6	6	3	2
12. TEC's would negotiate partial or full payment of some faculty salaries so that some university faculty could work with TEC on an ongoing, inload basis	3	3	8	3
13. TEC's would increasingly look to other sources (not State University System) to develop their inservice efforts	8	2	3	4
14. TEC efforts to influence preservice teacher education programs would be hindered	10	1	1	5

Table 19. Questionnaire Item: If in 1979-81 resources for TEC activity are no longer allocated through the State University System, i.e., instead all monies for TEC would be located in the school districts and TEC's would purchase individual faculty services privately, how would your participation and your college's participation in TEC probably be affected? (N=61)

				NO ANSWERS
1. The amount of time you spend in TEC service would	INCREASE 12/19.7%	DECREASE 24/39.3%	STAY THE SAME 24/39.3%	1/1.7%
2. The quality of service you provide for TEC would	IMPROVE 9/14.8%	DETERIORATE 11/18.0%	STAY THE SAME 40/65.6%	1/1.7%
3. The types of service you provide for TEC would	BROADEN 12/19.6%	BE LIMITED 18/29.5%	STAY THE SAME 28/45.9%	3/4.9%
4. You would continue to serve the same centers with which you have been working	YES 31/50.8%	NO 5/8.2%	MAYBE 24/39.3%	1/1.7%
5. You would be more directly compensated for your TEC service	YES 23/37.7%	NO 10/16.4%	MAYBE 25/40.9%	3/4.9%
6. There would be greater flexibility for TEC's to arrange services with you	YES 24/39.3%	NO 20/32.8%	MAYBE 15/24.6%	2/3.2%
7. One or more TEC's would probably negotiate through the university office of contracts and grants so that you could provide them with services on an ongoing basis	YES 19/31.1%	NO 7/11.4%	MAYBE 33/54.1%	2/3.2%
8. In general, you would be able to make arrangements with TEC's which are preferrable to those made under the current system	YES 15/24.6%	NO 23/37.7%	MAYBE 22/36.0%	1/1.7%
9. In general, your personal collaboration with TEC's would be comparatively	ENHANCED 14/22.9%	DIMINISHED 23/37.7%	STAY THE SAME 20/32.8%	4/6.5%
10. Relationships between universities and school districts would be essentially like they were before the establishment of TEC	YES 14/22.9%	NO 25/40.9%	MAYBE 19/31.1%	3/4.9%
11. Institutional collaboration between your college and TEC's would be	ENHANCED 5/8.2%	DIMINISHED 36/59.0%	STAY THE SAME 14/22.9%	6/9.8%
12. The possibility of achieving greater coordination between preservice and inservice teacher education would be	ENHANCED 9/14.8%	DIMINISHED 34/55.7%	STAY THE SAME 13/21.3%	5/8.2%
13. The overall contribution of your college to inservice teacher education would be	ENHANCED 5/8.2%	DIMINISHED 32/52.5%	STAY THE SAME 20/32.8%	4/6.5%
14. Your college would probably suffer a loss of faculty	YES 18/29.5%	NO 21/34.4%	MAYBE 16/26.2%	6/9.8%